



EMPACT Monitoring Coordination Workshop

May 2-4, 2000

[9 Evaluations received]

General Workshop Evaluation Form

Please evaluate the following items by checking the appropriate box:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
1. The workshop was well organized.	22%	55%	22%	0%	0%
2. Registration was fast and efficient.	55%	22%	0%	0%	22%
3. The meeting facility was convenient.	44%	33%	22%	0%	0%
4. The workshop packet was useful.	22%	66%	11%	0%	0%
5. The workshop support staff was courteous and helpful.	77%	22%	0%	0%	0%

6. Were there specific topics at the workshop that should have been:

- Omitted? -
- Added? Technology, information on leveraging EPA resources for projects (research assistance, additional funds), concise information about other projects.
- Emphasized more? Interaction, networking and time for informal conversation between projects, a technical discussion of the mechanical, electronic, database aspects of monitoring.
- Emphasized less? -

7. Did the workshop meet your expectations? Yes (100%) No (0%)

If No why not?

8. Overall, did you enjoy the workshop? Yes (77%) No (0%) No Answer (22%)

If No why not? Networking was good in the meeting but lacked outside of the workshop. The workshop should have been more organized. What was the goal of the workshop.

9. Which sessions or workshop activity would you consider a highlight:

Dave Jones & Guest speakers

Final Discussions

Break out sessions

Networking opportunity and informal opportunities to meet and discuss common issues.

The Site field trip & the Aquarium reception

10. Please include any additional comments:

Logistics:

- Hotel - overpriced, a location closer to the train station would have been better. Consider a Saturday night stay-over to minimize the airfare costs.
- Baltimore - a better geographic location (central USA) could have been chosen. Baltimore has high crime, please consider a safer city - such as Georgetown area of DC.

Workshop Management

- Provide power point note pages for audience during speakers/presentations, provide paper in folders at start of conference. Post power-point presentations on-line for those who couldn't attend.
- Provide biographical information on Break out session leads (i.e. Chuck Spooner).
- Get on schedule and stick to it - break outs waiting for other break out participants
- Poster session was too brief, consider holding after lunch or during a break in the day so don't lose people going to dinner
- Provide a more detailed agenda prior to the initial on-line registration
- Could have been 2 days instead of 3. Tuesday was of little use

Workshop Content:

- Wanted more discussion of a technical and scientific nature in the air-track monitoring session. The conversations were more steered towards outreach and community issues than technical issues
- What is tech transfer and what is it's purpose? How will it work?
- I was not clear about the purpose of conference.
- We talked about the monitoring end but not the education component, projects using successful education components might be added to a future workshop.

Suggestions for EMPACT Program:

- EMPACT staff at HQ needs to show more leadership in coordinating EMPACT projects and in communicating with projects
- Provide an index of EPA office acronyms
- EPA should make more effort at Regions providing advice and outreach to EMPACT Metro recipients nationwide
- More details on other projects, length of project, funding amount, list of partners to learn about other projects.

General Questions/ Comments:

- "As a new project I found out an enormous amount of information which will help give us direction and focus to our project"
- "Great opportunities to network and informally learn from other projects. Allowed to make good contacts. I'm sure I will coordinate with our regional office and other projects in my area because of this workshop so for me it was a very successful few days, Thanks!"

Thank you for your input!